

**Kieffer, Tiffany B.**

---

**From:** Scott Fanning [SFanning@aa-law.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, July 18, 2008 2:51 PM  
**To:** Kieffer, Tiffany B.  
**Subject:** Tucker v. Whelan Security Co. et. al. -- Conversation of 7/18/2008

Dear Ms. Kieffer:

This e-mail serves to memorialize our conversation earlier today requesting that Whelan Security Company and Whelan Security of Illinois, Inc. amend its answers to Plaintiff's first set of requests to admit. You reiterated your position that Judge Shadur's reasoning in *State Farm v. Riley* and *Brown v. County of Cook* does not apply to requests to admit, but only to pleadings under Rule 8. Additionally, you questioned the precedential importance of the decision as it has not been widely followed by many other judges. I then expressed our position outlined in our previous letter that there is no reason for the above referenced cases involving Rule 8 pleadings should not be applied to requests to admit as the reasoning is analogous. As such, we agreed to disagree on the matter. Please let me know if you disagree with anything in this summary.

Very truly yours,

Scott Fanning  
Attorney at Law  
Asonye & Associates  
11 South LaSalle Street, Suite 2140  
Chicago, Illinois 60603  
(312) 795-9110  
(312) 795-9114 (f)  
[scott@aa-law.com](mailto:scott@aa-law.com)  
[www.aa-law.com](http://www.aa-law.com)

8/11/2008

